



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TWO NOTES ON THE 'BIRDS' OF ARISTOPHANES.

By C. B. GULICK.

IN *Av.* 14 ff. we read :

ὁ πινακοπώλης Φιλοκράτης μελαγχολῶν,
ὅς τῳδ' ἔφασκε νῶν φράσειν τὸν Τηρέα,
τὸν ἔποφ', ὅς ὄρνις ἐγένετ' ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων,
κάπέδοτο τὸν μὲν Θαρρελείδου τουτονί, κτλ.

The well-known difficulty in v. 16 was felt by the scholiasts; one says: *τινὲς δὲ στίζουσιν εἰς τὸ ἐγένετο, εἶτα, ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων ἀπέδοτο τὸν κολοῖον καὶ τὴν κορώνην*, 'out of his stock of birds he sold us the daw and the crow.' The position of *καί*, however, makes this shift impossible. Some editors, acting on this hint, also place a comma after *ἐγένετ'*, but construe *ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων* with *τῳδ'* in v. 15, as if we had *τῳδε ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων νῶν φράσειν τὸν Τηρέα, i.e.* (he pretended) 'that of all birds these alone would tell us of Tereus.' Against this may be urged a doubt whether *τῳδε ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων* can be regarded as the equivalent of *τῳδε μόνω τῶν ὀρνέων*. Equally impossible, grammatically, is Bothe's interpretation, 'who became a bird without the aid of other birds,' *i.e.* not descended from bird ancestors, but metamorphosed into a bird. This would at least require *ἄνευ* instead of *ἐκ*. Others, again, believing (as in fact I do) that a joke lurks in *ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων*, explain it as referring to *homines superbos, aut leves et inconstantes*. For this last, they compare *τοὺς πετομένους* in v. 167, and *Nub.* 800, *κάστ' ἐκ γυναικῶν εὐπτέρων*. So Bergler, followed by D. W. Turner: 'who was turned into a bird, having been one before.' But in 167 *τοὺς πετομένους* refers to the fickle Athenians, whereas Tereus, though he married an Athenian wife, was himself a Thracian, and the joke is decidedly weak. Insipid, too, is the change to *ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων*, and no other emendation, e.g. Köchly's *ἐξ ἀνδρός ποτε*, or *ἄνθρωπός ποτ' ὦν* (adopted by Blaydes), has any probability, for none can account for the present state of the text.

Dr. Kennedy, in his translation, gives an explanation which is at least ingenious : 'who became a real bird from the bird-folk,' *i.e.* the Thracians, who were likened to birds because of their language, which seemed to the Athenians most like the inarticulate twittering of swallows. Cf. *Ran.* 680 ff., and Ἰλλυριοὶ κεκριγότες in v. 1521. Against this, however, Mr. Merry objects that we should expect ἐξ ὀρνέου rather than ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων.

The failure to reach an explanation which meets with general acceptance has led most modern scholars, beginning with Cobet, to reject the line altogether. Meineke drops it to the bottom of the page, and Mr. Rutherford (*Scholia Aristoph.* I, 428), following Cobet's favorite "adscript" hypothesis, declares with some positiveness that it is made up of two adscripts and the lemma of a third, viz. : τὸν ἔποπα was originally a note on Τηρέα (15), on which is still found in the scholia another note, ὃς ὄρνις ἐγένετο; while on οὐκ τῶν ὀρνέων (13) he assumes that there was a note something like ὃς ὄρνεα πωλεῖ. It is a curious chance, to say the least, that would bring about such a combination of gloss and lemma as to make a perfectly good verse. The difficulty of getting such a verse into the text is felt by Kock, although he, too, would like to omit it.

I cannot help thinking that the scholiast in Venetus starts with a right apprehension of the meaning as it stands, though his explanation does not go far enough to make his own mind clear to us. He says : παρ' ὑπόνοιαν δὲ εἶρηκε τὸ ὃς ὄρνις ἐγένετ' ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων· ἔδει γὰρ <εἰπεῖν> ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Brunck's criticism of this is no answer : "schema παρ' ὑπόνοιαν, quod alii comminiscuntur, ineptum et nive frigidius."¹ Before rejecting the verse finally I venture to offer a suggestion that may perhaps indicate in what way this line contains a jest παρ' ὑπόνοιαν.

First, against Mr. Rutherford's theory, the verse is not otiose. Tereus is here mentioned for the first time, and the circumstances of this play are so peculiar, in contrast with the essentially Athenian setting of all the other extant plays, that a word of explanation to the audience about Tereus, who is to play an important part later, is altogether appropriate. This explanation recurs in verse 47, in

¹ Brunck himself, among suggested readings, preferred ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων!

another and longer speech of Γέρων A, with something like positive insistence.

Secondly, we must take into account the character and purpose of the speaker, Γέρων A, whom we know by tradition as Euelpides. He soon discloses a strong desire to throw away utterly his former connection with men and his own identity as a human being. Without having a well-defined plan, such as that first proposed by Γέρων B in 162 ff., he is yet eager to join himself to the community of birds, and purposely affects bird ways and bird language. Cf. 27 f. *ἡμᾶς δεομένους ἐς κόρακας ἐλθεῖν*, and 34 f. :

*ἄστοι μετ' ἀστῶν, οὐ σοβοῦντος οὐδενός,
ἀνεπτόμεθ' ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος ἀμφοῖν τοῖν ποδοῖν.*

The idea of becoming a bird, or, at any rate, like a bird in ways and thinking, had possessed both old men before they started on their journey. So Athenaeus ix. 386 f : 'Αττικοὶ δ' εἰσὶ δύο πρεσβῦται ὑπὸ ἀπραγμοσύνης πόλιν ζητοῦντες ἐν ἣ κατοικήσουσιν ἀπράγμονα· καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀρέσκει ὁ βίος ὁ μετ' ὀρνίθων. ἔρχονται οὖν ὡς τοὺς ὀρνίθας, κτλ.

Thirdly, Γέρων A distinguishes himself in the first scene of the play as the character who utters all the dry, whimsical sayings. His puns are the readiest and best (79) ; he makes the comments and asides not appropriate to his graver companion (95 ff.) ; he gives the parody in 94, and he it is who asks the memorable question¹ (102), *πότερον ὄρνις ἢ ταῦς* ;

So, in his eagerness to identify himself with the birds, he is staunch in maintaining the bird-character of Tereus. The myth had told how Tereus was once a man. Not so, says our speaker. In place of the sober, uninteresting statement that he became a bird though once a man (Köchly), a statement which his audience expects from the beginning of the sentence, he suddenly shifts to another meaning of *ἐγένετο*, 'he proved himself a bird — of birds,' a genuine bird, untainted by human blood, in spite of the myth.

The expression *ὄρνις ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων*, therefore, may be taken as a comic superlative, formed on the analogy of *ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἐξ ἀγαθῶν* Plat. *Phaedr.* 274 A, used of persons of good birth and breeding,

¹ Not yet answered by some scholars.

the opposite being κακὸς καὶ κακῶν, *Soph. Oed. Tyr.* 1397. The conjunction is usual,¹ but not necessary. Hence we find ἀγαθοὶ ἐξ ἀγαθῶν *Andoc. de Myst.* 109, εὐγενὴς ἀπ' εὐγενοῦς *Eur. Orest.* 1676, as against εὐγενὴς καὶ εὐγενῶν *Soph. Phil.* 874. Most like our passage is Plato, *Alcib. I* 121 Α βασιλεῖς εἰσὶν ἐκ βασιλέων, where both βασιλεῖς and ἐκ βασιλέων are predicates. The only difference is the use of the article required by the double meaning.

In this verse, then, I conceive that two ideas are fantastically combined: (1) he was born a bird from — the birds (παρ' ὑπόνοιαν); and (2) he proved himself a bird — of the birds. According to the first, the speaker begins as if he intended to remind his audience of the fact known to them from the myth. His aversion to mankind, however, and insistence on the bird-character of Tereus, suggest to him a surprise, which would require his hearers to understand the line according to the second meaning.

Verses 167-170:

ἐκεῖ παρ' ἡμῖν τοὺς πετομένους ἦν ἔρῃ,
 τίς ὄρνις οὗτος; ὁ Τελέας ἐρεῖ ταδί·
 ἄνθρωπος ὄρνις, ἀστάθμητος, πετόμενος,
 ἀτέκμαρτος, οὐδὲν οὐδέποτε ἐν ταύτῳ μένων.

Here, again, is a passage where emendation has proved futile. Kock, thinking that τοὺς πετομένους is corrupt, conjectures that the name of the father of Teleas stood in its place, e.g. τὸν [Κλε]ομένους, τὸν [Δι]ομένους, or τὸν [Θεογ]ένους. He proposes to read:

ἐκεῖ παρ' ἡμῖν τὸν [. .]ένους ἦν ἔρῃ
 τίς ὁ νέος οὗτος; ὁ Τελέας, ἐροῦσ', ὅδε (or ἐροῦσί σοι).

This involves, in the short space of two lines, a change in five places, and certainly does not make vv. 169-170 any clearer. It leaves πετόμενος to be explained in 169, whereas Kock apparently sees no meaning in τοὺς πετομένους, since he wishes to get rid of it. The scholiasts give three inconsistent interpretations, all of which, it is

¹ Cf. "Thou art a gentleman and well deriv'd," *Two Gentlemen of Verona* v. 4.

clear, they derived with more or less acuteness from the text of the comedy itself, without having any real knowledge about Teleas. One says, ὁ Τελέας σκωπτικὸς ἄνθρωπος, which is certainly wrong. As Kock points out, Teleas on this occasion was not the mocker, but the mocked. Symmachus (about the year 100 A.D.), to whose redaction of the Alexandrian commentaries we owe our present scholia, had the absurd notion that Τελέας (or Τελεᾶς?) was the name of some bird, and he apparently read τελεᾶ for ἐλεᾶ in 885.¹

The third explanation referred to is that which probably contains the truth, although it rests merely on inference from the text: οὗτος διεβάλλετο ὡς εὐμετάβλητος τοὺς τρόπους. πρὸς γὰρ τῇ κιναιδίᾳ καὶ δειλίᾳ καὶ ὀψοφαγίᾳ [καὶ νοσφισμῷ Ven.] καὶ πονηρίᾳ ὀνειδίζουσι τὸν Τελέαν. In illustration, another note, doubtless from the same good source, quotes ἐπὶ τοῦ Τελέου Plato's Σύρφαξ (161 K.), νοεῖ μὲν ἕτερ', ἕτερα δὲ τῇ γλώττῃ λέγει.

It appears, then, that Teleas was noted for a certain versatility in crime, and was a person whose words could not be trusted. The fragment from Plato corroborates the epithets ἀστάβητος and ἀτέκμαρτος, the latter being explained by the scholiast as δόλιος. He belonged to a shifty, tricky class designated by τοὺς πετομένους, "the flighty," — flighty not merely in fickleness of purpose, as we use the term,² but in the sense of evading, dodging justice.³ The meaning of the passage may then be given thus: "If you ask about⁴ these flighty persons and say, 'What bird is that?' Teleas, an authority on the subject, for he is flighty himself, will speak up and tell you."

Who was this Teleas? Beyond question he is to be identified with the γραμματεὺς ταμιῶν of Athena (C.I.A. I, p. 226), who had been serving as clerk in the archonship of Chabrias, Ol. 91, 2, at the very

¹ Conversely, out of νηττάριον and φάττιον, Symmachus (ad *Plut.* 1012) manufactures two rogues, Nitarios and Batos.

² The transition to this sense is seen in *Eccles.* 899 (of a fickle lover), ἐφ' ἕτερον ἂν πέτοιτο.

³ Cf. Socrates's joke in the *Euthyphro*, 3 E: EUTH. Διώκω. SOC. Τίνα; EUTH. "Ὁν διώκων αὐτὸν δοκῶ μαίνεσθαι. SOC. Τί δέ; πετόμενόν τινα διώκεις; Here the legal application of διώκω is prominent throughout.

⁴ This construction, called Homeric by the scholiast (Z 239, K 416, Ω 390), is familiar enough.

time when the *Birds* was produced. That he was a clerk is hinted in v. 1024, where the Episkopos, asked by Γέρων B who had sent him on his mission, replies φαῦλον βιβλίον Τελέου τι. The γραμματεῖς were often low persons, morally depraved and socially insignificant,¹ hence all recollection of his office was lost later. The scholiast at 1024 makes no mention of it. By flattery and servility Teleas had worked himself into favor with the authorities. At the same festival (ἐν ἄστει, March, 414 B.C.) at which Aristophanes brought out the *Birds*, we find Phrynichus in the Μονότροπος classing Teleas with the obtrusive foreigner Execestides² in the following manner (*Frag.* 20 K.):

- A. μεγάλους πιθήκους οἷδ' ἐτέρους τινὰς λέγειν,
 Λυκέαν, Τελέαν, Πείσανδρον, Ἐξηκεστιδην.
 B. ἀνωμάλους εἶπας πιθήκους . . .
 ὃ μὲν γε δειλός, ὃ δὲ κόλαξ, ὃ δὲ νόθος.

Here ἀνωμάλους, 'capricious,' well characterizes τοὺς πετομένους, and if ὃ μὲν γε δειλός may refer to Lyceas (not otherwise known), ὃ δὲ κόλαξ proclaims Teleas as a time-server and trimmer, in accordance with ἀτέκμαρτος and ἀστάθμητος.

Teleas, however, was not a foreigner, any more than Pisander was, although his family may have been obscure. His full name was Τελέας Τελενίκου Περγασήθεν.³ This makes Kock's proposed change impossible, for the father's name was Τελένικος,⁴ and not a name ending in -ένης or -μένης.

Further, it would appear that he had been concerned in some embezzlement of the funds of Athena, if we may trust the phrase καὶ νοσφισμῶ, which, however, is omitted in Ravennas. At any rate, he was greedy and forward (*Pac.* 1003 ff.), a hungry glutton, like most rhetors in Aristophanes (cf. *Av.* 1694 ff.), and a heeler of the most despicable type.

¹ Boeckh, *Staatshaushaltung*³ I, 227.

² Also held up to ridicule *Av.* 11, 764, 1527. This throws a curious light on the way in which the same obnoxious characters are attacked at the same time by different comic poets.

³ *C.I.A.* I, 127, 128, 159, 183.

⁴ A Τελένικος is mentioned in the list of persons implicated in the mutilation of the Hermae, Andoc. *de Myst.* 35.